



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,012	03/19/2004	Jac-ryong Park	1572.1220	8189

21171 7590 04/05/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

COCKS, JOSIAH C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3749

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/804,012	PARK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Josiah Cocks	3749	

All Participants:(1) Josiah Cocks (USPTO).(2) Deidre Davis (applicant's representative).**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 March 2006**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

NA

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative to correct only a formal matter and did not include discussion of the merits or substantive issues of the application. The amendment filed 3/13/2006 that accompanied an RCE appeared to inadvertently omit a status identifier for claim 8. In the interest of avoiding unnecessary delay in the prosecution of the application the examiner contacted applicant's representative and requested a faxed corrected version of the amendment of 3/13/2006 that included a status identifier for claim 8. Accordingly, as the amendment filed 3/13/2006 was technically non-complaint due to the omission of the status identifier this amendment was not entered, however, the corrected amendment has been entered.